

Appl. No. 10/007,298
Reply to Examiner's Action dated February 6, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants have carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Action and respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. The Applicants previously amended Claims 1, 8 and 15 and canceled Claims 6, 13 and 20. In this response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 8 and 15 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-19 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,683,547 to DeGroot. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because DeGroot fails to teach each and every element of Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14.

Claim 1 includes the elements "instruction grouping logic implementing instruction grouping rules" and "multiply-accumulate instructions being grouped based on said rules." DeGroot does not teach these elements, and therefore does not anticipate Claim 1. By similar reasoning, DeGroot fails to anticipate each and every limitation of Claim 8. Therefore, Claims 1-5 and 7-14 are novel over DeGroot and are allowable.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Appl. No. 10/007,298
Reply to Examiner's Action dated February 6, 2006

II. Rejection of Claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeGroot in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,683,547 to Chamdani, *et al*, in further view of U.S Patent No. 3,569,939 to Doblmaier. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, because the combination of DeGroot, Chamdani, Doblmaier fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claims 15-19.

Claims 15-19 include the elements “an instruction issue unit, containing grouping logic implementing instruction grouping rules,” and “multiply-accumulate instructions being grouped based on said rules.” The examiner does not cite the references for teaching these elements, and Applicants do not find such a teaching therein. Moreover, the Applicants do not find a suggestion in the cited references of these elements. Therefore, the combination of DeGroot, Chamdani, Doblmaier fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claims 15-19, and the claims are nonobvious.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and allow issuance thereof.

Appl. No. 10/007,298
Reply to Examiner's Action dated February 6, 2006


III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-19.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 12-2252.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.


Charles W. Gaines
Registration No. 36,804

Dated: April 4, 2006

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800